



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/600,982	09/14/2000	Alphonsus Johannes Van Tol	PTT-98	4191

7265 7590 01/12/2005  
MICHAELSON AND WALLACE  
PARKWAY 109 OFFICE CENTER  
328 NEWMAN SPRINGS RD  
P O BOX 8489  
RED BANK, NJ 07701

EXAMINER

HOANG, THAI D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2667

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/600,982

Applicant(s)

VAN TOL, ALPHONSUS  
JOHANNES

Examiner

Thai D Hoang

Art Unit

2667

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 September 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The headings were missing in the specification such as the background or related art of the invention, summary of the invention, and brief description of the drawings, etc...

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

### **Arrangement of the Specification**

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or  
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

### ***Drawings***

Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships between an Internet Service Provider (ISP) with a Traffic telephone exchange (VKC) and between an Internet Service Provider (ISP) with a calling point, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 2667

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 5 and 11 recite "in case of calamities, such as failure of a calling point, Internet traffic is redirected from the first traffic telephone exchange (vkc) to the calling point in the second traffic telephone exchange (vkc)." The specification, page 4, line 22-28, does not disclose to support this limitation.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Forrest, US Patent No. 6,084,875.

Regarding claims 3 and 9, in FIG. 2 Forrest disclose a "Traffic Route Control" functionality for Internet Service Providers (ISPs) 260, is implemented by a local service provider (SSP-A) 210 to allow the local service provider (SSP-A) 210 to identify specific routes 270 and assign them to individual ISPs 260. Initially, as indicated in FIG. 3, an Internet user 200 dials the access number for a specific 260 (step 300). This call is then triggered as an AIN call (step 305), which is routed from an end office 210, e.g., a Service Switching Point (SSP) for a wireline Internet user, serving the Internet user 200 to a Service Control Point (SCP) 240 (step 310) via a Signaling Transfer Point (STP) 230. The SCP 240 then analyzes the calling number and the called (ISP) number (step 315), compares them with a list of calling numbers, ISP numbers, and associated trunklines (step 320), which is stored in a database 250, and identifies the dedicated ISP trunkline(s) 270 (step 325), which will be used to route the call to the appropriate ISP 260. Finally, a call connection is established between the Internet user 200 and the ISP 260 (step 350). See fig. 1-3, col. 2, lines 8-32, and col. 4, lines 21-55.

Regarding claims 4 and 10, Forrest discloses the system comprises a plurality of SSPs 100 (telephone exchange), wherein each of the plurality of SSPs is connected to a plurality of STP 110 (traffic telephone exchange) for routing incoming and outgoing

calls to a destination. Therefore, each SSP must have a specific number to refer the calls handled by a specified STP. See fig. 1-3, col. 2, lines 8-32, and col. 4, lines 21-55.

Regarding claims 6 and 13, since a user dials the specific number to access a specific ISP; therefore, the specific number dialed by the user in the system disclosed by Forrest is inherently independent from a calling point.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 7, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forrest as shown above in view of Kremer, US Patent No. 5,442,620.

Regarding claims 5 and 11, Forrest does not disclose if a failure occurs at a node the transmission path will be redirected. However, Kremer discloses an apparatus and method for preventing communications circuit misconnections in a bidirectional line-switched ring transmission system. Kremer discloses that a failure occurs at a node the transmission path will be redirected, fig. 10-11, abstract, col. 9, line 27 – col. 11, line 50. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt Kremer's method into Forrest's system in order to improve customer service.

Regarding claims 7 and 14, since a user dials the specific number to access a specific ISP; therefore, the specific number dialed by the user in the system disclosed by Forrest is inherently independent from a calling point.

Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forrest as shown above in view of Lewis et al., US Patent No. 5,537,464, hereafter referred to as Forrest and Lewis.

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Forrest does not disclose a specific sequence number 067xxx for the Netherlands. However, Lewis discloses the 555xxxx sequence number. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to modify the sequence number disclosed by Lewis in order to adapt with conventional system existing in each country. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt Lewis' method into Forrest's system in order to adapt with conventional system existing in each country.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not



Art Unit: 2667


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thai D Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10:00am-18:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thai Hoang

  
CHI PHAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 11/26/05